



ELSEVIER

Available at  
**WWW.MATHEMATICSWEB.ORG**  
 POWERED BY SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

JOURNAL OF  
 COMPUTATIONAL AND  
 APPLIED MATHEMATICS

Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics 155 (2003) 455–459

[www.elsevier.com/locate/cam](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/cam)

## Letter to the Editor

# On the maximum modulus of weighted polynomials in the plane, a theorem of Rakhmanov, Mhaskar and Saff revisited

S.B. Damelin

*Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Georgia Southern University, P.O. Box 8093,  
 Statesboro, GA 30460, USA*

Received 22 April 2002; received in revised form 15 November 2002

**Abstract**

Let  $\Sigma \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be a closed set of positive capacity at each point in  $\Sigma$  and  $w: \Sigma \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  a continuous weight with  $|z|w(z) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $|z| \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $z \in \Sigma$  if  $\Sigma$  is unbounded. Assume further that the set where  $w$  is positive is of positive capacity. A classical theorem, obtained independently by Rakhmanov and Mhaskar and Saff says that if  $S_w$  denotes the support of the equilibrium measure for  $w$ , then  $\|P_n w^n\|_{\Sigma} = \|P_n w^n\|_{S_w}$  for any polynomial  $P_n$  with  $\deg P_n \leq n$ . This does not rule out the possibility that  $|P_n w^n|$  may attain a maximum outside  $S_w$ . We prove that if in addition,  $\Sigma$  is regular with respect to the Dirichlet problem on  $\mathbb{C}$  and if it coincides with its outer boundary, then all points where  $|P_n w^n|$  attain their maxima must lie in  $S_w$ . The case when  $\Sigma \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  consists of a finite union of finite or infinite intervals is due to Lorentz, von Golitschek and Makovoz. Counter examples are given to show that our requirements on  $\Sigma$  cannot in general be relaxed.

© 2002 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.

*MSC:* primary 42C15; 42C05; secondary 65D05

*Keywords:* Logarithmic potential; Maximum modulus; Polynomial

**1. Introduction and statement of main result**

The purpose of this note, is to extend a theorem of Lorentz et al. [3, Proposition 1.4.1] dealing with the characterization of sets in the complex plane where weighted polynomials attain their maximum values. To set the scene for our investigation, let  $\Sigma \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be a closed set and  $w: \Sigma \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  a continuous weight. If  $\Sigma$  is unbounded, assume further that  $|z|w(z) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $|z| \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $z \in \Sigma$ . We will

*E-mail address:* [damelin@gsu.cs.gasou.edu](mailto:damelin@gsu.cs.gasou.edu) (S.B. Damelin).

also henceforth suppose that  $\Sigma$  is of positive capacity at each point in  $\Sigma$ , i.e., for every point  $z_0 \in \Sigma$ , the set  $\{z \in \Sigma : |z - z_0| < \delta\}$  has positive capacity for any  $\delta > 0$  and that the set where  $w$  is positive, has positive capacity. We set  $Q := -\log w$  and call  $w$  *strongly admissible* and  $Q$  the external field associated with  $w$ . The *equilibrium measure*, see [4], in the presence of an admissible external field,

$$Q: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is the unique Borel probability measure  $\mu_w$  with compact support on  $\Sigma$  satisfying for a unique constant  $F_w$ ,

$$M_w(z) := U^{\mu_w}(z) + Q(z) - F_w \leq 0, z \in S_w := \text{supp}(\mu_w) \quad (1.1)$$

and

$$M_w(z) \geq 0, \text{ q.e. } z \in \Sigma. \quad (1.2)$$

Here,  $U^{\mu_w}$  denotes the logarithmic potential of  $\mu_w$ , i.e.,

$$U^{\mu_w}(z) := \int_{\Sigma} \log \frac{1}{|z - t|} d\mu_w(t), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}$$

and q.e.  $z \in \Sigma$  means that (1.2) holds everywhere on  $\Sigma$  with the exception of a set of logarithmic capacity zero. A classical theorem, obtained independently in [4, Corollary 3.2.6] is well known:

**Proposition 1.1.** *Let  $w$  be strongly admissible. Then*

$$\|P_n w^n\|_{\Sigma} = \|P_n w^n\|_{S_w}$$

*for every polynomial  $P_n$  with  $\deg P_n \leq n$ .*

Proposition 1.1 says that the sup norm of a weighted polynomial lives in the set  $S_w$ . It does not however rule out the possibility that a weighted polynomial may take a maximum outside  $S_w$ . In this note, we show that if we assume some additional structure on the underlying set  $\Sigma$ , namely if we assume that it is regular with respect to the Dirichlet problem on  $\mathbb{C}$  and that it coincides with its outer boundary, then all points where  $|P_n w^n|$  attain their maxima are contained in the set  $S_w$ . We also show by way of counter examples, that our additional assumptions on the set  $\Sigma$  cannot in general be removed. Throughout let  $\Pi_n$  denote the class of polynomials of degree at most  $n, n \geq 1$ .

For our main result, we need two important definitions:

- (a) The outer domain  $\Omega$  of  $\Sigma$  is the unbounded component of the complement  $\bar{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Sigma$ . The *outer boundary* of  $\Sigma$  is defined to be  $\partial\Omega$ , the boundary of  $\Omega$ . For example we shall need in Remark 1.3(b) below the fact (see [4, Corollary 4.5]), that if  $w \equiv 1$ ,  $S_w$  is contained in the outer boundary of  $\Sigma$ .
- (b) We shall say that a point  $z \in \Sigma$  is regular with respect to the Dirichlet problem (or for short *regular*) on  $\mathbb{C}$  if the Green's function for  $\Sigma$ , (see [4, p. 108]), is continuous at  $z$ . If every point in  $\Sigma$  is regular, then  $\Sigma$  is regular. For example, if  $\Sigma$  is simply connected or a finite union of finite or infinite real intervals, then  $\Sigma$  is regular.

Using the above two concepts, we shall henceforth adopt the following convention.  $\Sigma$  will be called *strongly regular* if it is regular and if the outer boundary of  $\Sigma$  coincides with  $\Sigma$ .

It is easy to see, in view of (a) and (b), that if  $\Sigma$  is simply connected with empty interior then  $\Sigma$  is strongly regular. Moreover if  $\Sigma$  is a finite union of finite or infinite intervals, then  $\Sigma$  is also strongly regular. Examples of sets in the plane which are strongly regular are line segments and simple closed contours. If  $\Sigma$  is strongly regular and  $w$  is strongly admissible, then it follows from [4, Theorems 1.4.4 and 1.5.1 (iv')] that  $U^{\mu_w}$  is continuous everywhere in  $\mathbb{C}$  and hence that (1.2) holds everywhere on  $\Sigma$ .

Following is our main result:

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $w$  be strongly admissible and let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

(a) *Then for every collection of polynomials  $\{P_{n,k}\}_{k=1}^m \in \Pi_n$ ,  $n \geq 1$*

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^m |P_{n,k}| w^n \right\|_{\Sigma} = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^m |P_{n,k}| w^n \right\|_{S_w}. \quad (1.3)$$

(b) *Assume in addition that  $\Sigma$  is strongly regular. Then if  $x_0 \in \Sigma$  is a point where  $\|\sum_{k=1}^m |P_{n,k}| w^n\|_{\Sigma}$  is attained, then  $x_0 \in S_w$ .*

**Remark 1.3(a).** (a) Theorem 1.2(a) for  $m = 1$  is [4, Corollary 3.2.6] which was obtained independently by Rakhmanov and Mhaskar and Saff.

(b) For  $m \geq 1$  and under the assumption that  $w$  is convex, positive and  $\Sigma = (c, d)$  with  $-\infty \leq c < 0 < d \leq \infty$ , Theorem 1.2(b) follows from [2, Theorem 2.6]. When  $m = 1$  and  $\Sigma$  is a finite union of finite or infinite real intervals, Theorem 1.2(b) has been shown earlier in [3, Proposition 4.1.1]. Our proof of Theorem 1.2(b) uses methods of logarithmic potential theory which were developed in [1, Lemma 2.2]. As is shown in Remark 1.3(b) below, it essentially cannot be improved further.

**Remark 1.3(b).** In this remark we explain why the strong regularity assumptions of Theorem 1.2(b) cannot be dropped in general. Indeed, let us take in Theorem 1.2(b),  $w \equiv 1$ . Then using [4, Corollary 4.5], we know that  $S_w$  is contained in the outer boundary of  $\Sigma$ . If this outer boundary was not  $\Sigma$  itself, one could choose  $P_n$  to be constant and then the maximum of  $P_n w^n$  is attained everywhere, not just on  $S_w$ . For a particular  $w \neq 1$ , Saff and Totik in [4, p. 157] construct an annulus with positive interior for which Theorem 1.2(b) fails.

## 2. Proof of main result

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1.2.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** We will need the inequality, see [4, Theorem 3.5.1 and Corollary 3.5.3],

$$|P_n w^n(z)| \leq \exp(-nM_w(z)) \|P_n w^n\|_{S_w}, \quad z \in \Sigma, P_n \in \Pi_n, n \geq 1. \quad (2.1)$$

Let  $\{P_{n,k}\}_{k=1}^m \in \Pi_n$  be given. We will assume that  $m = n$  for the general case follows in exactly the same way. Let us also choose  $x_0 \in \Sigma$  for which

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n |P_{n,k}| w^n \right\|_{\Sigma} = \sum_{k=1}^n |P_{n,k}|(x_0) w^n(x_0).$$

Now choose  $Q_n \in \Pi_n$  such that

$$\|Q_n w^n\|_{\Sigma} = \|Q_n w^n\|_{S_w} = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n |P_{n,k}| w^n \right\|_{\Sigma} = \sum_{k=1}^n |P_{n,k}|(x_0) w^n(x_0) = |Q_n(x_0) w^n(x_0)|. \quad (2.2)$$

This is done by considering

$$Q_n(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n \varepsilon_k P_{n,k}(x), \quad \varepsilon_k = \text{sign } P_{n,k}(x_0)$$

and using (2.1). See [5, Lemma 1]. Theorem 1.2(a) then follows.

The difficult task is to now show that  $x_0 \in S_w$ . Indeed, using (1.1), (1.2), (2.1) and (2.2) it follows that

$$x_0 \in S_w^* := \{z \in \Sigma: M_w(z) = 0\}.$$

If  $w$  is convex, positive and  $\Sigma = (c, d)$  with  $-\infty \leq c < 0 < d \leq \infty$  it follows from [2, Theorem 2.6] that  $S_w^* = S_w$  and Theorem 1.2(b) would then follow. In general, however it is not true that  $S_w^* = S_w$ . We now show that indeed  $x_0 \in S_w$  and in doing so we establish Theorem 1.2(b). Actually we will prove the following:

Let  $\mu := \mu_w$  and suppose that

$$U^\mu(x_0) + \frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(x_0)| \geq \max_{z \in S_w} \left( U^\mu(z) + \frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(z)| \right). \quad (2.3)$$

Then  $x_0 \in S_w$ . To see this, consider the function

$$U^\mu + \frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n|.$$

Firstly  $U^\mu$  is harmonic outside  $S_w$  and therefore  $U^\mu + (1/n) \log |Q_n|$  is subharmonic outside  $S_w$ . It is also subharmonic at  $\infty$ . To see this, simply observe that

$$U^\mu + \frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n| = U^{\mu - \nu_n},$$

where  $\nu_n$  is the normalized counting measure of  $Q_n$  with mass  $\|\nu_n\| \leq \|\mu\| = 1$ . See also [1, Lemma 2.2].

By the maximum principle for subharmonic functions, see [4, Theorem 1.2.4],  $U^\mu + (1/n) \log |Q_n|$  attains its maximum on  $S_w$ . If the maximum is attained at a point outside  $S_w$ , then necessarily  $U^\mu(z) + (1/n) \log |Q_n|(z)$  is constant for every  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ . If this is the case, we may let  $|z| \rightarrow \infty$  and conclude that

$$U^\mu(z) = -\frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n|(z), \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

This is clearly impossible as  $U^\mu$  is continuous everywhere on  $\mathbb{C}$ . Thus if (2.3) holds for  $x_0$ , then  $x_0 \in S_w$ . Thus everything boils down to showing (2.3).

Indeed, using (1.5) and (1.6), we first see that

$$\max_{z \in S_w} (U^\mu(z) + Q(z)) = F_w \leq U^\mu(z) + Q(z), \quad z \in \Sigma.$$

Thus applying the above and (2.2) we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & U^\mu(x_0) + \frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(x_0)| \\
 &= \frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(x_0) w^n(x_0)| + U^\mu(x_0) + Q(x_0) \\
 &\geq \max_{z \in S_w} \frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(z) w^n(z)| + \max_{z \in S_w} (U^\mu(z) + Q(z)) \\
 &\geq \max_{z \in S_w} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(z) w^n(z)| + U^\mu(z) + Q(z) \right] \\
 &= \max_{z \in S_w} \left[ U^\mu(z) + \frac{1}{n} \log |Q_n(z)| \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus (2.3) holds and we have proved Theorem 1.2(b).  $\square$

## References

- [1] S.B. Damelin, A. Kuijlaars, The support of the extremal measure for monomial external fields on  $[-1, 1]$ , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 351 (1999) 4561–4584.
- [2] E. Levin, D.S. Lubinsky, Orthogonal Polynomials for Exponential Weights, Springer, Berlin, 1996.
- [3] G. Lorentz, M. von Golitschek, Y. Makovoz, Constructive Approximation, Advanced Problems, Springer, Berlin, 2001.
- [4] E.B. Saff, V. Totik, Logarithmic Potentials with External Fields, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1997.
- [5] J. Szabados, Weighted Lagrange and Hermite-Fejér interpolation on the real line, J. Inequalities Appl. 1 (1997) 99–123.